

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE HELD ON JANUARY 17,
1975, IN THE FACULTY CONFERENCE ROOM,
SIXTH FLOOR, LISNER HALL

- 1 The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. by President Elliott, who presided.

Present: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtsbauer, Albert, Birnbaum for Feffer, Black, Boswell, Brenner, Cassidy, Cottrell, Fox, Grub, Harris, Hill, Hobbs, N. Kramer, Meltzer, Metivier for Linton, Morgan, Naeser, Nash, Schiff, Schmidt, Smith, Stevens, Vaill, Wallace, Wood; Parliamentarian Schwartz.

Absent: Eisenberg, C. Elliott, R. Kramer, Liebowitz, Mosel, Sapin, Solomon, Tillman, and Tsangaris.

President Elliott recognized Professor Elizabeth Adams who made an announcement regarding the survey forms she distributed to the Senate members before the meeting. As a representative of the Marvin Center Governing Board, she explained that the Board was conducting a survey of utilization of services at the Marvin Center to determine how well existing goals were being met and that views and recommendations on this question were being solicited from a broad representation of the University community by means of the survey forms. Professor Adams asked that the members participate in this endeavor by completing the survey forms and returning them to the Marvin Center Governing Board, Second Floor, Marvin Center.

The President then recognized and welcomed Professor Ruth A. Wallace who was serving as the replacement for Professor Lois G. Schwoerer, who was presently on leave of absence.

President Elliott introduced the new Registrar of the University, Mr. Robert Gebhardtsbauer, and welcomed him to his first Senate meeting as Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

- 2 The minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1974, were approved as distributed.

- 3 Under Old Business, concerning reintroduction and further consideration of Resolution 73/7, "A Resolution Approving Revisions to the Faculty Code and Ordinances," Professor Naeser, on behalf of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, reported that the Committee did not meet during the holidays and, therefore, had no amendments to offer for consideration at this meeting. He said that the last information submitted by the Committee and, subsequently, postponed by the Senate until February would be re-submitted at that time.

- 4 Professor Stevens, on behalf of the Executive Committee, recommended the following nominees for election to the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee: Frederick C. Kurtz, Temporary Chairman (SGBA); Jeffrey M. Albert (Law); John G. Boswell (Education); Marie M. Cassidy (Medical); Raymond R. Fox (Engineering); Herman H. Hobbs (GSAS); and John A. Morgan, Jr. (Columbian). There were no nominations from the floor and the slate was elected unanimously. 75-76

- 5 Under Brief Statements, Professor Stevens reminded members that annual reports were due from all committees at the February Senate meeting. Professor Stevens then asked for suspension of the rules for the purpose of nominating and electing a member to the Executive Committee for the months of January and February as a replacement for Professor Schwoerer who informed him that she regretfully would be unable to complete her term as a member of the Executive Committee because of the press of business incurred on her leave. Professor Naeser moved that the membership of the Executive Committee remain at four for the remainder of the term, and Professor Fox seconded. The question was called, the motion put and carried unanimously. Professor Stevens then asked for suspension of the rules again to consider a request from Professor Margaret McIntyre for appointment of a Special Committee to consider her case. No objection was heard to suspending the rules, and Professor Stevens moved that the Executive Committee be authorized to appoint a Special Committee to consider the case of Professor McIntyre. Professor Morgan seconded the motion. The question was called, the motion put and carried unanimously.

Professor Hill reported to the Senate that the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students had been working diligently on a draft resolution on its statement on University policy on academic dishonesty and that the Committee expected to have it ready for circulation shortly and for approval by the Senate at its February meeting.

Professor Morgan made the following statement concerning the University Bookstore which he requested be made a matter of record:

During the usual pandemonium of registration and the beginning of classes, I think a number of us experience problems with book orders and it is fashionable to criticize and fuss about the University Bookstore, and I would just like to have in the record that in this particular instance I had a major problem which turned out not to be the result of failure on the part of the Bookstore but, indeed, quite the contrary. An unusual effort was made by the Bookstore personnel, particularly, Mr. Eugene Benson, who solved the problem that affected approximately 75 or 80 students. In the ten and one-half years I have been here, I have not observed greater cooperation from that part of the University than has been the case since this particular man came here, and responsible administrators ought to take it under advisement as well--he's good!

President Elliott then read the following statement to the Senate:

As recent publicity has made clear, I have expressed opposition to the exercise of full faculty privileges to those, and I quote from the Code, 'in active status full-time service of the rank of assistant professor and higher of the faculty of a school, college, or comparable educational division,' unless those persons are also in the full-time pay status of The George Washington University. In taking this position, I believed, and still do, that the University has a greater responsibility to those for whom service includes major economic commitment and, therefore, the interests of such faculty members are best protected if decisions are not unduly influenced by others whose relationship does not include the economic factor. If, however, the faculty of the University does indeed interpret this provision of the Code to extend to those members full rights and responsibilities of University faculty participation, I shall not oppose that position.

Professor Stevens noted that the Board of Trustees had accepted the amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan lowering the quorum to 125 adopted by the Faculty Assembly at its last meeting October 25, 1974, but that the two additional amendments adopted by the Assembly at that meeting had not been accepted by the Board of Trustees and he presumed they would be before the Assembly for reconsideration if it so wished. Referring to the President's statement, Professor Cassidy asked President Elliott if he meant that if the Faculty Assembly accepted the position that a group of "off-campus" faculty have the same rights and privileges as the faculty group identified by direct economic affiliation that he would recommend to the Board of Trustees that it either accept or reject that position. President Elliott responded that he tried to make very clear in his statement that he believed the relationship was different and, though he had opposed it in the past, he would no longer oppose it. Professor Morgan stated that he thought it was important to understand what was involved in this matter and he responded to the President's statement, as follows:

The interpretation that you [the President] referred to and which you opposed is one that has been the interpretation of both faculty and administration for quite some period of time. That interpretation was challenged by the Faculty Organization Plan Review Committee and a recommendation to change it was made at the last Faculty Assembly and that recommendation was voted down. Subsequent to that action, the Board of Trustees made a new interpretation of that provision, concluding that certain people should not have participated in the vote of confidence on the Vice President for Medical Affairs. So, the situation at present is that the interpretation which you said you will not oppose if it is the will of the faculty is the most recently expressed will of the faculty at the last Faculty Assembly meeting.

In response to Professor Morgan's statement, President Elliott made the following statement:

I have said on a number of occasions that there is a serious lack of codification, if you please, of procedures, including definitions of faculty membership and various kinds of membership. During the past two or three weeks, I have been reading in the archives of the University, going back to 1932, where I find that on occasions - on one occasion in 1932, another in 1946, and another in 1956 - proposals to the Board of Trustees, or to the President and the Board of Trustees, which would bring to a clarification such questions as those which we are now debating, which never quite got to the point of final approval, either by the faculty considering them, or having been presented to the President, were referred back to the faculty for some kind of review and codification which did not occur. I shall be happy to share these documents with any who are interested. But your point that the so-called 'long-standing' interpretation of the membership of this group in the faculty is one which I fail to find historical evidence of ever having been consummated and, therefore, such interpretation of the Faculty Assembly made in October was the first definitive interpretation of the rights and privileges of membership of that faculty. I had to go back to 1932 as the date which the by-laws of The George Washington University Hospital and the definitions of faculty membership were last fully defined. Now, I think if we pursue this further and debate it further, we come down to the point where the assumption must be made that when the Code and

Ordinances governing academic personnel of the University were adopted in 1963, all preliminary documents which pertained to any or all units of the University were either superseded or they were simply ignored.

Professor Nash, responding to the President's statement, stated:

The history is fascinating, but I am more interested in finding some way to get before the faculty the elements of this question so that we can find out what the will of the faculty is. I honestly do not think that what happened at the last Faculty Assembly was very useful in terms of getting before the faculty all the elements of this decision - what we had was a massive presentation by the Medical School from its top to its bottom, I gather, telling us that it was imperative that we support their view of who is a full-time faculty member. I think that since this has become such an important issue, we ought to give it to a committee or find some way to get the pros and cons of the issue out in written form so we can all look at it and then conduct a vote so we can honestly know what the will of the faculty is. I think that at our last meeting I mentioned the fact that I think a lot of us see this as having its detrimental aspects in terms of depriving us of representation - we obviously are being inundated by Medical School professors, 330 or so of them - and I do not know exactly how to suggest that we get this information out. Perhaps the Executive Committee can find a way to get one of our committees working on this but I do think before we have a vote we ought to find a way to get the pros and cons out where they are more visible than they have been so far.

Professor Morgan pointed out that if the rest of the faculties had turned out at the last Faculty Assembly in approximately the same percentage as the Medical School faculty, they would have outnumbered the "inundators" by a considerable margin. Professor Stevens said that in the past in figuring out the quorum for Faculty Assemblies, it had been necessary to obtain a net figure beforehand and divide it by 4 to arrive at the 25% quorum figure. He said that the net figure which included the so-called "off-campus" members of the Medical School faculty had always been obtained from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, at least during the times he had been responsible for determining the quorum figure, and that this was a basis for precedent. Professor Kramer said that if he remembered correctly the amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan referred to elimination of faculty privileges for those who were "off-campus" relating specifically to the Medical Center for two issues only - (1) membership in the Faculty Assembly, and (2) election of members to the Faculty Senate. He said it bore no relationship to their function as full-time faculty members in any other category, and, therefore, he did not know whether the changing of the Faculty Organization Plan at that point would really represent a major change in the precedents that have been established nor in the definition of full-time faculty as presently contained in the Code, and that it might further cloud the issue rather than clarify it. Further discussion followed by Professors Hobbs and Morgan. Professor Fox inquired when the next Faculty Assembly would be held, and Professor Stevens advised that it was scheduled for Tuesday, January 28, 1975, at 3:30 p.m., in Lisner Auditorium.

6 The meeting was adjourned by President Elliott at 2:38 p.m., upon motion made and seconded.



Robert Gebhardtshauer
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

January 8, 1975

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 17, 1975, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the sixth floor of Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1974
3. Old Business:

Reintroduction and further consideration of Resolution 73/7, "A RESOLUTION APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE FACULTY CODE AND ORDINANCES," Professor Charles R. Naeser, Chairman, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee

4. General Business:

Nomination ^{for} and election of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee:
Frederick C. Kurtz, Temporary Chairman (SGBA); Jeffrey M. Albert (Law); John G. Boswell (Education); Marie M. Cassidy (Medical); Raymond R. Fox (Engineering); Herman H. Hobbs (GSAS); and John A. Morgan, Jr. (Columbian)

5. Brief Statements
6. Adjournment



Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

January 1, 1964

Dear Mr. [Name]:

I am writing to you in response to your letter of December 15, 1963, regarding the [Topic].

I am sorry that I cannot provide you with a more definitive answer at this time, but the [Topic] is still under review.

I will be sure to contact you again as soon as a final decision has been reached.

I am sure that you will understand the need for thoroughness in this process.

I am very sorry for any inconvenience this may cause you.

I am sure that you will find this information helpful.

I am very sorry for any inconvenience this may cause you.

I am sure that you will find this information helpful.

I am very sorry for any inconvenience this may cause you.